



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,600	03/05/2001	Kenichi Saitoh	54575USA3A.007	8111
32692	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			BODDIE, WILLIAM	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/700,600	SAITO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	William Boddie	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/23/01.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehrich, Jr. (US 3,046,432) in view of Taguchi (US 4,380,372).

With respect to claim 1, Nehrich discloses, a light reflective film product (33 in fig. 3) to be intimately contacted with a light-emitting surface of a light source (32 in fig. 3) in such a manner that a part of said light-emitting surface is covered with said film (clear from fig. 3), thereby increasing the intensity of the light emitted from the remaining and uncovered part of the light-emitting surface (col. 4, lines 14-19), characterized in that the light reflective film product further comprises a light-transmittive adhesive film, and in that the reflective film comprises a dielectric reflective film (col. 4, lines 14-19) facing said adhesive film whereby in use the reflective surface is opposed to the light-emitting surface of the light source (clear from fig. 3).

Nehrich does not expressly disclose the use of a light-transmittive adhesive film to bond the reflector to the light-emitting surface.

Taguchi discloses, bonding a light reflective film product (18 and 19 in fig. 16) to liquid crystal cell with a light-transmittive adhesive film (19 in fig. 16; col. 12, lines 11-16, 56-59).

Taguchi and Nehrich are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, layered light control devices containing reflective films.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to include the light-transmissive adhesive of Taguchi in the light reflective film of Nehrich.

The motivation for doing so would have been to use the light reflective film as a reinforcing member (Taguchi; col. 12, lines 15-16).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nehrich and Taguchi for the benefit of a more rugged light emitting device thereby obtaining the invention as specified in claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Nehrich and Taguchi disclose, a light reflective film product of claim 1 (see above).

Nehrich further discloses, a light-emitting apparatus characterized by being provided with:

a) a light source (phosphor layer 32 in fig. 3), and
b) a light reflective film product intimately contacted, with a light-emitting surface of said light source (clear from fig. 3) in such a manner that a part of said light-emitting surface is covered with said light reflective film (also clear from fig. 3); and showing an increased intensity of the light emitted from the remaining part of the light emitting surface of said light source (col. 4, lines 14-19), said part being uncovered with said light reflective film (also clear from fig. 3).

As to the limitation requiring that the reflective film product contact the light-emitting surface through a transparent adhesive film this limitation has been previously

rejected in the light reflective film product of claim 1. See the above rejection for the merits of the combination of the two pieces of prior art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chapman (US 2,810,978) discloses the adhering of a reflector to a glass bottle via a transparent adhesive. Rosenfeld (US 2,987,619) discloses, adhering a reflector to a translucent luminescent adhesive layer. MacLennan et al. (US 5,903,091) discloses a reflector that surrounds a light source. Finally Corth et al. (US 4,99,090) discloses a reflector that is coated onto the exterior of a light source.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Will Boddie whose telephone number is (571) 272-0666. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 - 4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wlb
9/29/06

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

